REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13-23 remain pending in this application. No claims have been amended.

I.   CLAIMS 1 AND 11

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narayanan* (U.S. Patent Number 7,346,771) in view of *Ananian* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028451. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As the Examiner is aware, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142.

Claim 1 states in-part, "*means for anonymously advertising availability information indicating real-time availability of the plurality of resources of said first network and real-time availability of the plurality of resources of said second network between said first network and said second network*" (emphasis added). Similar features can also be found in amended Claim 11. Applicant submits that the above features are not taught or suggested by the combination of *Narayanan* and *Ananian*.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that *Narayanan* does not teach this feature and cited *Ananian* as teaching this feature. However, upon a careful review of Ananian, it is clear that *Ananian* merely teaches protecting personal information of consumers. *See*, for example, paragraphs [0002], [0025] and [0031]. In particular, *Ananian* describes "anonymously capturing" consumer information so as to protect the privacy of consumers and increase consumer confidence in Internet-based transactions. Anonymous "capturing" of information does not teach or suggest any mechanism for "anonymous advertising," as is claimed in the present application.

Thus, the combination of *Narayanan* and *Ananian* does not teach or suggest each and every element of, in the detail of, Claims 1 and 11 of the present invention. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 1 and 11.

II.   CLAIMS 3-5, 13-15 and 22

Claims 3-5, 13-15 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narayanan* in view of *Ananian* and further in view of *Ramstrom*, (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,004). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

With respect to Claims 3 and 13, on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the combination of *Narayanan* and *Ananian* failed to teach or suggest: "*a unified and integrated switch connected to said first network and said second network, said unified and integrated switch having common resources, a first portion of the common resources being dedicated to the first service provider and being capable of being configured by the first service provider, a second portion of the common resources being dedicated to the second service provider and being capable of being configured by the second service provider,*" as claimed in Claim 3 and similarly claimed in Claim 13 of the present application. The Examiner has cited *Ramstrom* as teaching this feature.

However, although *Ramstrom* does describe a single switch that includes a number application modules functioning as logical communications nodes, these application modules are not "common resources" within the switch. Instead, each application module is specific to the particular logical communications node and is a "discrete" module. In addition, although *Ramstrom* does mention that the single switch also includes "common resources" available to all of the application modules, *Ramstrom* does not teach or suggest that a portion of the common resources can be dedicated to a service provider, nor that the common resources can be configured by that service provider. *See,* for example, column 8, lines 11-54 and col. 8, line 55 – col. 9, line 32 of *Ramstrom.*

Thus, the combination of *Narayanan, Ananian* and *Ramstrom* does not teach or suggest each and every element of, in the detail of, Claims 3 and 13 of the present invention. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 3 and 13.

Claims 4-5 and 14-15 are dependent claims that include the same exemplary features described above with respect to Claims 3, 11 and 13. Therefore, for at least the reasons recited above with respect to Claims 3, 11 and 13, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 4-5 and 14-15.

With respect to Claim 22, Applicant further respectfully submits that the combination of *Narayanan, Ananian* and *Ramstrom* does not teach or suggest: "*said unified and integrated switch is operable to add a portion of said common resources dedicated to the first logical communications node to the second logical communications node to provision the inter-provider IP service.*" As discussed above, the application modules in *Ramstrom* are separate and distinct. There is nothing to teach or suggest that an application module in *Ramstrom* would be able to allocate a portion of their module to another application module.

Thus, the combination of *Narayanan, Ananian* and *Ramstrom* does not teach or suggest each and every element of, in the detail of, Claim 22 of the present invention. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of Claim 22.

III.   CLAIMS 6-7, 16-17 and 23

Claims 6-7, 16-17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narayanan* (U.S. Patent Number 7,346,771) in view of *Ananian* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028451. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 6 and 16 recite: "*calculating cost information in real-time for use of the additional resources for the inter-provider IP service prior to provisioning the inter-provider IP service; and comparing the cost information to cost requirement information associated with the request to determine whether to utilize the additional resources for the inter-provider IP service*" (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that the above features are not taught or suggested by the combination of *Narayanan* and *Ananian*.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that this feature is taught by *Narayanan*. In particular, the Examiner stated that the agreed upon attributes between devices in *Narayanan* are interpreted as the cost requirements and the cost information of the system, as described in col. 5, lines 22-53 of Narayanan.

Narayanan is directed to a method for establishing a chained authentication system for distributing public keys between autonomous systems, such as routers. The passage cited by the Examiner describes a particular embodiment of Narayanan in which ISPs have an agreement to exchange routing table information. Although Narayanan indicates that the agreement can include cost information, there is no teaching or suggestion that the cost information is calculated "in real-time."

Thus, the combination of *Narayanan* and *Ananian* does not teach or suggest each and every element of, in the detail of, Claims 6 and 16 of the present invention. As a result,

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 6 and 16.

Claims 7, 17 and 23 are dependent claims that include the same exemplary features described above with respect to Claims 1, 6 and 16. Therefore, for at least the reasons recited above with respect to Claims 1, 6 and 16, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 7, 17 and 23.

IV.   CLAIMS 8-10 and 18-20

Claims 8-10 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narayanan* in view of *Ananian* and further in view of *Ramstrom*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

With respect to Claims 8 and 18, on page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the combination of *Narayanan* and *Ananian* failed to teach or suggest: "*calculate pricing scenarios using the request, obtain real-time resource information including the availability information, calculate real-time prices for each of the pricing scenarios using the real-time resource information and customize the cost information based on knowledge of the identities of the first service provider and the second service provider, the request and the real-time prices,*" as claimed in Claim 8 and similarly claimed in Claim 18 of the present application. The Examiner has *Ramstrom* as teaching this feature. In particular, the Examiner cited col. 38, lines 22-63 and col. 41, lines 45-53 of *Ramstrom* as teaching this feature.

However, the cited passages of *Ramstrom* merely describe a "charging manager" 147 that provides services connected with "chargeable events" associated with calls. The charging manager 147, for example, performs the following task, as described on col. 41, lines 47-56: "At the end of a call, a cost calculation can be performed on either the number or meter pulses." Thus, in *Ramstrom*, cost calculations are performed during and/or after a call. *Ramstrom* does

not teach or suggest any mechanism for calculating "pricing scenarios" or "real-time prices for the pricing scenarios" as claimed in the present application.

Thus, the combination of *Narayanan, Ananian* and *Ramstrom* does not teach or suggest each and every element of, in the detail of, Claims 8 and 18 of the present invention. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 8 and 18.

Claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 are dependent claims that include the same exemplary features described above with respect to Claims 8 and 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons recited above with respect to Claims 8 and 18, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 9, 10, 19 and 20.

V. CLAIM 21

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narayanan* in view of *Ananian* and further in view of *Ramstrom*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

On pages 9-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the combination of *Narayanan* and *Ananian* failed to teach or suggest: "*incorporating business relations among the at least two service providers dynamically and in real-time in said provisioning, wherein the business relations include at least contracts and prices,*" as recited in Claim 21 of the present application. The Examiner has cited *Ramstrom* as teaching this feature. In particular, the Examiner cited col. 41, lines 45-56 and col. 2, lines 14-21 and lines 36-42 as teaching this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

Again, *Ramstrom* is related to a single switch that includes a number of application modules functioning as logical communications nodes. *Ramstrom* also describes a number of resource modules (i.e., charging manager) that provide services to the application modules. The resource modules do not facilitate or incorporate "business relations" among the application

modules when provisioning an inter-application module service (i.e., a call), as defined in the present application. In particular, the resource modules do not incorporate "contracts" among the application modules. Moreover, the application modules themselves do not facilitate or incorporate "contracts" among themselves when provisioning a call.

As such, there is nothing in *Ramstrom* to teach or suggest that "contracts" among different application modules are incorporated into the provisioning process. Moreover, there is nothing in *Ramstrom* to teach or suggest that "contracts" among different application modules are incorporated "in real-time" into the provisioning process.

Thus, the combination of *Narayanan, Ananian* and *Ramstrom* does not teach or suggest each and every element of, in the detail of, Claim 21 of the present invention. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claim 21.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

AYMAN ESAN NASSAR

Dated: February 10, 2008

/Holly L. Rudnick/
Holly L. Rudnick
Reg. No. 43,065

Garlick, Harrison & Markison
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, Texas 78716-0727
(Direct) (214) 387-8097
(Fax) (214) 387-7949
(Email) *hrudnick@texaspatents.com*